

Pre-Meeting for Cleanup Standards Meeting – December 5, 1995

Attendees

Ravi Batra
Tim Howell
Annette Primrose
Steve Slaten

Chris Dayton
Melinda Kassen
John Rampe

Tom Greengard
John Law
Tim Reeves

John Hopkins
Mike McCann
George Setlock

According to CDPHE, removing Human Health plus Fish standards from the surface water standards leaves a hole due to the large values proposed as standards without the fish classification

Segment 4 standards would stay the same

Point of compliance (POC) is proposed to be the outfall of the terminal ponds

Segment 5 values will be calculated for loading and base flows in the streams' thalwegs channel centerline. The maximum loading for Segment 5 will be calculated with dilution but no treatment to determine what values upstream will enable the standards to be met at the POC

Delayed surface water discussion until Tuesday noon

Steve Slaten stated that by noon tomorrow, we must have

- things can't agree on
- unresolved issues

The coordinating group must be provided background on each unresolved issue

The group agreed that the purpose of tomorrow's meeting is to find out what we agree on, what should be changed, and what the group disagrees on by Friday. A simplified explanation for each issue must be developed for management

John Law - We should rewrite the groundwater section, but soils and subsurface soils are all right. Groundwater should take a simplified approach, with standards simplified to 100 x MCLs

Melissa Kassen felt that shorter explanations are better. We should present

- proposal vs. our recommendation
- need a single position for surface water
- What are issues?

John Rampe - There are 3 issues

- 1) POC: Interim or Point of Evaluation for RADs
Standards should apply from Indiana to outfall of ponds
Standards should apply where we lose control of water
- 2) Use issue: What is surface water used for?
Ponds
Stream segments
All uses vs. Reasonably expected uses
- 3) What are numbers (standards), where are these applied?

Melinda Kassen - Let's be clear that the Vision starts when most of the site is gone. So what are numbers at the walk away when two buildings are left. Interim Period is defined as period between two buildings and no buildings

John Rampe - There needs to be a use discussion

Tim Howell - When are standards met at POC? This is at the end. Then why treat the interim any differently?

Melinda Kassen - We have an NPDES permit, and we must care about interim period. We will not endanger public health or the environment

ADMIN RECORD

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION
REVIEW WAIVER PER
CLASSIFICATION OFFICE

John Rampe - It seems as if we are mixing time frames when discussing standards

Discussion concerning the Temporary Treatment Facility

Effluent from TTF with \$111 M lifecycle cost

Effluent from TTF with \$170 M cost

Note \$170M excludes additional waste handling costs

John Hopkins - Cannot ship waste off site, values are way too high

Points of Contention

- 1) 15 mrem for surface soils is nationwide standard
- 2) There is a large difference between 15 mrem and open space PPRGs (10^{-6})
Risk level for 15 mrem is closer to 10^{-4}

Laura Brooks - 15 mrem dose limit is being proposed by EPA for nationwide use